

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Planning Division

City of Arts & Innovation

Draft Negative Declaration

WARD: 1

1. **Case Number:** P14-1073 (Conditional Use Permit)

2. **Project Title:** La Cadena Wireless Telecommunications Facility

3. **Hearing Date:** May 07, 2015

4. **Lead Agency:** City of Riverside

Community Development Department

Planning Division

3900 Main Street, 3rd Floor Riverside, CA 92522

5. **Contact Person:** Brian Norton, Associate Planner

Phone Number: (951) 826-2308

6. **Project Location:** 1115 La Cadena Drive, situated on the northwesterly corner of the intersection of

La Cadena Drive and Interchange Street, in the CG – Commercial General Zone

7. Project Applicant/Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

Property OwnerApplicantEngineerBuster and Marilyn BurrisLA SMSA LP, dba VerizonCortel, LLC1115 La Cadena DriveWirelessAndrea Urbas

Riverside, CA 92501 15505 Sand Canyon Road, 18301 Von Karman, Suite 910

BLDG, D, 1st Fl. Irvine, CA 92612

Irvine, CA 92618

8. **General Plan Designation:** C – Commercial

9. **Zoning:** CG – Commercial General

10. Description of Project:

The applicant is requesting a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow the construction of a 60-foot high wireless telecommunications facility camouflaged as a pine tree and related equipment enclosure, within an approximately 300 square foot enclosure. The proposed lease area is generally situated towards the northerly portion of the property, approximately 120 feet from La Cadena Drive, 130 feet from Interchange Street and approximately 437 feet southeasterly from the closest sensitive receptor, single family residential. The facility, including all related ground mounted equipment, will be located on-site at grade level.

The monopine as proposed will consist of a single antenna array installed at a centerline height of approximately 49-feet above ground level. The antenna array will consist of twelve (12) antennas,

approximately eight (8) feet in height, attached to three (3) separate sectors. In addition, twelve (12) RRU's will be added to the back side of the antenna arrays. The pole of the monopine will consist of a faux bark finish to resemble the texture and color of a pine tree trunk. Faux branches and pine needles are proposed to extend out beyond the antenna arrays to camouflage the antennas. In addition, all antennas will be camouflaged with matching 'sock' covers.

The proposal also includes the installation of an approximately 300 square-foot equipment enclosure. The enclosure is proposed to accommodate new radio equipment cabinets, supporting cables and utilities as well as a standby generator behind a decorative 6-foot high masonry wall. A metal gate is proposed along the westerly side of the enclosure for access to the support equipment.

11. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the Project's surroundings:

The project site is approximately 0.49 acres, and is developed with a vacant fueling station convenience store building.

| | Existing Land Use | General Plan Designation | Zoning Designation |
|--------------|--|---------------------------------|---|
| Project Site | Industrial | C – Commercial | CG – Commercial General |
| North | Office and Manufacturing | B/OP – Business/ Office Park | CG – Commercial General |
| East | Office/Technical School (Across Interstate-215) | I - Industrial | O-SP – Office and Specific Plan (Hunter Business Park Specific Plan) Overlay Zones |
| South | Storage Yard | C – Commercial | CG – Commercial General |
| West | Business Office | C – Commercial | CG – Commercial General |

12. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financial approval, or participation agreement.):

None

13. Other Environmental Reviews Incorporated by Reference in this Review:

- a. General Plan 2025
- b. GP 2025 FPEIR

14. Acronyms

| AICUZ - | Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study |
|---------|--|
| AQMP - | Air Quality Management Plan |
| AUSD - | Alvord Unified School District |
| CEQA - | California Environmental Quality Act |
| CMP - | Congestion Management Plan |
| EIR - | Environmental Impact Report |
| EMWD - | Eastern Municipal Water District |
| EOP - | Emergency Operations Plan |
| FEMA - | Federal Emergency Management Agency |

FPEIR - GP 2025 Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Report

GIS - Geographic Information System

GhG - Green House Gas GP 2025 - General Plan 2025 IS - Initial Study

LHMP - Local Hazard Mitigation Plan

MARB/MIP - March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port

MJPA-JLUS - March Joint Powers Authority - Joint Land Use Study

MSHCP - Multiple-Species Habitat Conservation Plan MVUSD - Moreno Valley Unified School District NCCP - Natural Communities Conservation Plan

OEM - Office of Emergency Services

OPR - Office of Planning & Research, State
PEIR - Program Environmental Impact Report

PW - Public Works, Riverside

RCALUC - Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission
RCALUCP - Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

RCP - Regional Comprehensive Plan

RCTC - Riverside County Transportation Commission

RMC - Riverside Municipal Code RPD - Riverside Police Department RPU - Riverside Public Utilities

RTIP - Regional Transportation Improvement Plan

RTP - Regional Transportation Plan
RUSD - Riverside Unified School District

SCAG - Southern California Association of Governments SCAOMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District

SCH - State Clearinghouse

SKR-HCP - Stephens' Kangaroo Rat - Habitat Conservation Plan

SWPPP - Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan

USGS - United States Geologic Survey
WMWD - Western Municipal Water District
WQMP - Water Quality Management Plan

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

| The environmental factors checked b impact that is a "Potentially Significant | | | one |
|--|---|--|--------|
| Aesthetics | Agriculture & Forest Resources | Air Quality | |
| Biological Resources | Cultural Resources | Geology/Soils | |
| Greenhouse Gas Emissions | Hazards & Hazardous Materials | Hydrology/Water Quality | |
| Land Use/Planning | Mineral Resources | Noise | |
| Population/Housing | Public Service | Recreation | |
| Transportation/Traffic | Utilities/Service Systems | Mandatory Findings of Significance | |
| | | | |
| DETERMINATION: (To be completed) | ted by the Lead Agency) | | |
| On the basis of this initial evaluation recommended that: | n which reflects the independent jud | gment of the City of Riverside, | it is |
| The City of Riverside finds that the proposand a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will | | cant effect on the environment, | \leq |
| The City of Riverside finds that although there will not be a significant effect in the by the Project proponent. A MITIGATED | is case because revisions in the Project ha | we been made by or agreed to | |
| The City of Riverside finds that the property ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT | | ct on the environment, and an | |
| The City of Riverside finds that the proposignificant unless mitigated" impact on the an earlier document pursuant to applicate based on the earlier analysis as described required, but it must analyze only the effective forms. | e environment, but at least one effect 1) had be legal standards, and 2) has been added on attached sheets. An ENVIRONME | as been adequately analyzed in ressed by mitigation measures | |
| The City of Riverside finds that although because all potentially significant effects DECLARATION pursuant to applicable s EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, i proposed Project, nothing further is require | (a) have been analyzed adequately in a tandards, and (b) have been avoided or m neluding revisions or mitigation measur | in earlier EIR or NEGATIVE itigated pursuant to that earlier | |
| Signature | _ | Date | |
| Printed Name & Title | | ForCity of Riverside | |
| | | | |



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Planning Division

City of Arts & Innovation

Environmental Initial Study

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to Projects like the one involved (e.g., the Project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on Project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the Project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a Project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as Project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. **Mitigation Measures.** For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measure which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the Project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING | Potentially Significant | Less Than Significant | Less Than Significant | No Impact |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| INFORMATION SOURCES): | Impact | With Mitigation | Impact | Impact |
| | | Incorporated | | |
| 1. AESTHETICS. Would the Project: | | | | |
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | | | \boxtimes | |
| 1a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 Figure 5.1-1 – Scenic and Special Boulevards and Park Table 5.1-B – Scenic Parkways) | | | | |
| The proposed 60-foot high wireless telecommunications facility However, the applicant is proposing the telecommunications facilithe monopine is generally consistent with existing structures in match and blend with existing mature trees in the immediate area. trees, in proximity of the telecommunications facility to further project as conditioned will have a less than significant impact d | ty to be disguise the immediate a In addition, the a blend the facility | d as a pine tre area and the d applicant has r y in with its s | e (monopine). esign of the reflected three urroundings. | The height of monopine will live broadleaf Therefore, the |
| area. | | | | |
| b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but r limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildin within a state scenic highway? | | | | |
| 1b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 Figure 5.1-1 – Scenic and Special Boulevards, Parkway 5.1-B – Scenic Parkways, the City's Urban Forest Tree II There are no scenic highways within the City that could pooutcroppings, and historic buildings which could be potentially and implementation of the applicable provisions in Chapter 19.53 site location, operation, development and design standards, as we proposed project will have a less than significant impact to a scen | ys, Table 5.1-A Policy Manual) tentially be imparted as a resourced as Telvell as with the mic resource dire | - Scenic and pacted. Further esult of this precommunication recommended | r, there are roject. Througons Facilities) conditions of | no trees, rock the compliance related to the approval, the |
| c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character quality of the site and its surroundings? | or | | | |
| 1c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan Guidelines) | 2025 FPEIR, 2 | Zoning Code, | Citywide Des | ign and Sign |
| The proposed project consists of a telecommunications facility d will match and blend with existing mature trees in the immediat provided live trees planted within proximity to the telecommun surroundings. Therefore, the project as proposed will not degrade less than significant impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively t | e area. In addition ications facility the existing vis | on, the applica to visually in sual character | ant has been c tegrate the fac of the area an | onditioned to cility with its d will have a |
| d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare whi would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area | | | | |
| 1d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, Title 19 – Artic and Sign Guidelines) No new lighting is proposed under this project. Therefore, no in result of this project which will adversely affect day or nighttime. | npact directly, i | ~ | | |
| | | | | |

| | SUES (AND SUPPORTING FORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|------------|---|---|--|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 2. | AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: | | | | |
| | In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information complied by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the Project: | | | | |
| | a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | | | | |
| Th | 2a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-2 – Age Project is identified as being in an urban and built up land area ject will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively on a | of the City in | an existing de | evelopment. T | herefore, the |
| | b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | | | | |
| loc | 2b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-3 - W Figure 5.2-4 – Proposed Zones Permitting Agricultural Usa eview of Figure 5.2-2 – Williamson Act Preserves of the Generated within an area that is affected by a Williamson Act Preserves ject site is not zoned for agricultural use; therefore, the Project williamson Act Preserves | es, and Title 1 al Plan 2025 e or under a V | (9) FPEIR reveals Williamson Ac | that the Proje t Contract. M | ect site is not loreover, the |
| | c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | | | | |
| The for | 2c. Response: (Source: GIS Map – Forest Data) e subject site is zoned CG – Commercial General and does not coest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover nor does it has this Project directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | |

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | | | | |
| 2d. Response: (Source: GIS Map – Forest Data) The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-perce therefore no impacts will occur from this Project directly, indirectly | | | es it have any | y timberland, |
| e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | | | | \boxtimes |
| 2e. Response: (Source: General Plan – Figure OS-2 – Agricu Preserves, Title 19 – Article V – Chapter 19.100 – Residenti Forest Data) The Project is located in an urbanized area of the City in an existing urban and built-out land and therefore does not support agricultural the conversion of designated farmland to non-agricultural uses. The Conversion of the City in an existing urban and built-out land and therefore does not support agricultural the conversion of designated farmland to non-agricultural uses. | ng developme resources or | C Zone and R. ent. Additional operations. Th | A-5 Zone and ly, the site is the Project will | GIS Map – identified as not result in |
| percent native tree cover. Therefore, no impacts will occur from conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of fore | n this Project | directly, ind | | |
| 3. AIR QUALITY. | | | | |
| Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the Project: | | | | |
| a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | | | | \boxtimes |
| 3a. Response: (Source: South Coast Air Quality Manager (AQMP)) The proposed wireless telecommunications facility is consistent w Scenario" in all aspects. The Air Quality Management Plan (AQM comprehensive program that will lead the SCAB into compliance wi of Riverside is located within the Riverside County sub region of the determined that implementation of the General Plan 2025 would get standards of the AQMP. The General Plan 2025 contains policies to that serve to reduce air pollutant emissions over time and this Proposed Project is consistent with the 2007 AQMP, the proposed the applicable air quality plan – AQMP and therefore this Project who to the implementation of an air quality plan. b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or Projected air quality violation? 3b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Taber Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District* An Air Quality Model was conducted using CaLEEMod. The result project would generate emissions far lower than the SCAQMD three was determined to be less than significant directly, indirectly and the scanding can be supposed to the significant directly, indirectly and the scanding can be supposed to the supposed control of the scanding can be supposed to the supposed can be sup | rith the Gener (IP) for the So th all Federal he SCAG Properally meet at promote mix roject is conserved will not be so that the state of the second properal for the second p | ral Plan 2025 uth Coast Air and State air of jections. The ttainment fore ked use, pedes distent with the ot conflict or of npact directly. CAQMD CEQ P, CalEEMod quality model enificance for a | Program "Typ Basin (SCAB quality standar General Plan casts and attaitrian-friendly ese policies. Obstruct imple, indirectly or A Regional Model) showed that air quality emi | pical Growth) sets forth a ds. The City 2025 FPEIR nment of the communities Because the mentation of cumulatively Significance the proposed assions and it |
| c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | | | | |

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| 3c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Tab Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management Distri- Model) | ct's 2007 Air | Quality Man | agement Plan | , CalEEMod |
| Per the GP 2025 FPEIR, AQMP thresholds indicate future construction result in significant levels of NO_X and ROG, both ozone precursors, F are expected to decrease by 2025, all criteria pollutants remain above | M-10, PM-2. | 5, and CO. Al | | |
| The portion of the Basin within which the City is located is designat 2.5 under State standards, and as a non-attainment area for ozone, standards. | | | | |
| Because the proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan 202 result of the Project were previously evaluated as part of the cumulat Plan 2025 Program. As a result, the proposed Project does not previously evaluated and for which a statement of overriding consid FPEIR. Further per the response in 3B above, an air quality model co (short-term and long-term) to the SCAQMD daily thresholds and st Therefore, cumulative air quality emissions impacts are less than sign | ive analysis or result in any erations was anducted using nows that esta | f build out and new significand adopted as par adopted fas par | cicipated under ant impacts the t of the Gener cound the project | r the General nat were not al Plan 2025 ect emissions |
| d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | | | | |
| Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District Short-term impacts associated with construction from General Pla emissions from grading, earthmoving, and construction activities. requires individual development to employ construction approached dust control, tuning of equipment, limiting truck idling times). Add any ambient air quality standard or contribute substantially to an Project is proposed on a previously developed site and does not invibecause the Project consists of wireless telecommunications facil receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and a less than cumulatively from this Project. | an 2025 typic Mitigation Most that minimizalitionally, the existing or provolve substantity. Therefore | easures of the ze pollutant en Project will no pojected air quial grading or re, the Project | will result in General Plan missions (e.g., ot result in the ality violation earthmoving to will not exp | 2025 FPEIR watering for e violation of a because the activities and cose sensitive |
| e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | | | | |
| 3e. Response: The Project would not expose a substantial number of people to objegenerated by the proposed use. Therefore, no impact to creating cumulatively. | | | | |
| 4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the Project: | | | | |
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | | | | |
| 4a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – St Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHG | | | | |

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING | Potentially Significant | Less Than Significant | Less Than Significant | No | |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|--|
| INFORMATION SOURCES): | Impact | With | Impact | Impact | |
| INFORMATION SOURCES). | F | Mitigation | F | | |
| | | Incorporated | | | |
| Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP | | | | | |
| Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCI | | | | -/ – МЗПСР | |
| The project site is located within an urban built-up area and is prima | _ | • | | A search of | |
| the MSHCP database and other appropriate databases identified no potential for candidate, sensitive or special status | | | | | |
| species, suitable habitat for such species on site, Federal Species of Concern, California Species of Special Concern, and | | | | | |
| California Species Animal or Plants on lists 1-4 of the California | | | | | |
| little chance that any Federally endangered, threatened, or rare speci no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively will occur to fed | | | | | |
| habitats. | erany endang | crea un catene | a, or rare spe | cies of their | |
| b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or | | | | \boxtimes | |
| other sensitive natural community identified in local or | | | | | |
| regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California | | | | | |
| Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | | | | | |
| 4b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – St | anhan's Kana | ravoo Pat (SK | D) Cova Dasav | wa and Othan | |
| Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHO | | | | | |
| Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 - MSHCP | | | | | |
| Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 - MSHCP Narrow Endemic | | | | | |
| Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHC | | | rea, MSHCP | Section 6.1.2 | |
| - Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine As The project is located on a fully developed site and is not identified a | | | Critaria Calle | or those that | |
| would affect riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community | | | | | |
| Project will have no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively | | | | | |
| sensitive natural community with implementation of the proposed pr | oject. | | | | |
| c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected | | | | | |
| wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act | | | | | |
| (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological | | | | | |
| interruption, or other means? | | | | | |
| 4c. Response: (Source: City of Riverside GIS/CADME USGS | Quad Map La | yer) | | | |
| The Project is located within an urbanized area where no federally | | | | | |
| Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool | | | | | |
| Project site. The Project site does not contain any discernible drain hadring as its and thus descent include USA COF invital strained drains. | | | | | |
| hydric soils and thus does not include USACOE jurisdictional drawould have no impact to federally protected wetlands as defined by | | | | | |
| and cumulatively. | beetion 404 0 | i the Clean W | ater rict direct | iy, manecay | |
| d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native | | | | \square | |
| resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with | | | | | |
| established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, | | | | | |
| or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | | | | | |
| 4d. Response: (Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 –Figure | | UCD links as | F | | |
| The Project site is located within an urban built-up area and is not sensitive, species of concern, or special status species or suitable has | | | | | |
| surveys or mitigation measures are required. Therefore, there is | | | | | |
| movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife spe | | | | | |
| wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery si | ites. Therefor | re, a no impa | ct directly, in | ndirectly and | |
| cumulatively will occur related to the movement of any native r | | | | | |
| established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or imp with implementation of the proposed Project. | eue the use of | native wildli | ie nursery site | es will occur | |
| r rrry | | | | | |

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | | Incorporated | | |
| 4e. Response: (Source: MSHCP, Title 16 Section 16.72.040 - Mitigation Fee, Title 16 Section 16.40.040 - Establishing Riverside Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual) | | • | | • |
| Implementation of the proposed Project is subject to all applicable F to the protection of biological resources and tree preservation. In administration Code Section 16.72.040 establishing the MSHCP mi Threatened and Endangered Species Fees. | dition, the Pro | ject is require | d to comply w | ith Riverside |
| Any Project within the City of Riverside's boundaries that proposes follow the Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual. The Manual docume and removal of all trees in City rights-of-way. The specifications is care established by the International Society of Arboriculture, the National Standards Institute. No trees under the applicant's project right-of-way; therefore the project will have no impacts related to project. | ents guideline n the Manual e National A are proposed | s for the plant are based on rborists Associato be planted | ing, pruning, national stand ciation, and the or removed f | preservation, lards for tree he American |
| f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | | | | |
| 4f. Response: (Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 – Figure and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Stephen Mathews Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan a Sobrante Landfill Habitat Conservation Plan) The proposed Project is not located within an MSHCP Cell. The telecommunication facility on the subject site which is fully developed directly, indirectly and cumulatively related to the proposed project as | s' Kangaroo nd Natural on the project co ped with a w | Rat Habitat Community C nsists of the | Conservation Construction of | Plan, Lake Plan, and El of a wireless |
| 5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. | | | | |
| Would the Project: a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines? | | | | |
| 5a. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.5-A Histor and Appendix D, Title 20 of the Riverside Municipal Code) | rical Districts | and Neighbo | rhood Conse | rvation Areas |
| The Project does not involve substantial development, grading ac historic resources as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA G required for construction activities to be halted and a qualified at archaeological items be found during grading and construction activity. Native American Graves Protection Act Guidelines and State law immediate area; leave the remains in place; contact the City Man Riverside County Coroner. Therefore, impacts to historical resour cumulatively. | rchaeologist to tty. If human require that lager, the Cit | owever, a con- to be hired sharemains are for construction pay Historic Pres | dition of appround cultural, und during the personnel halt eservation Off | roval will be historical or e grading, the work in the icer, and the |
| b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines? | | | | |
| 5b. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Arch Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Appendix D – Cultural Reso The Project does not involve substantial development, grading activit | ources Study) | | _ | |

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| INFORMATION SOURCES): | _ | Mitigation Incorporated | _ | |
| resources as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. construction activities to be halted and a qualified archaeologist to be be found during grading and construction activity. If human remains Graves Protection Act Guidelines and State law require that construction remains in place; contact the City Manager, the City Historic Protection, impacts to historical resources are less than significant discourses. | hired should ns are found action personn reservation Of | cultural, histor during the gra el halt work in ficer, and the | ical or archaed ding, the Nation the immedia Riverside Cou | ological items ive American te area; leave |
| c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | | | | |
| 5c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Policy HP-1.3) The Project does not involve substantial development, grading ac historic resources as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Grequired for construction activities to be halted and a qualified a archaeological items be found during grading and construction activ Native American Graves Protection Act Guidelines and State law immediate area; leave the remains in place; contact the City Mar Riverside County Coroner. Therefore, impacts to historical resour cumulatively. | duidelines. Horchaeologist to ity. If human is require that hager, the City | wever, a conc o be hired shoremains are for construction py Historic Pre | dition of apprould cultural, und during the personnel halt servation Officers | oval will be historical or grading, the work in the icer, and the |
| d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | | | | |
| Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Archaeological Survey Reports The proposed wireless telecommunications facility (monopine) is previously disturbed. A condition of approval will be required for archaeologist to be hired should cultural, historical or archaeologicactivity. If human remains are found during the grading, the Native law require that construction personnel halt work in the immediate Manager, the City Historic Preservation Officer, and the Rivers recommended condition of approval, less than significant impacts and the survey recommended condition of approval, less than significant impacts and the survey recommended condition of approval, less than significant impacts are survey as the property of th | proposed to be or construction cical items be American Grate area; leave side County | n activities to found during aves Protection the remains | be halted and grading and n Act Guidelin in place; con | d a qualified construction nes and State tact the City |
| 6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. | | | | |
| Would the Project: a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | | | | |
| 6i. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 Appendix E – Geotechnical Report) | | | | |
| Seismic activity is to be expected in Southern California. In the Cit Project site does not contain any known faults and the potential fo with the California Building Code regulations will ensure that no directly, indirectly and cumulatively. | r fault rupture | e or seismic sl | naking is low. | Compliance |
| ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? | | | | |
| 6ii. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appended The San Jacinto Fault Zone located in the northeastern portion of | | | | ocated in the |

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING | Potentially Significant | Less Than Significant | Less Than Significant | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| INFORMATION SOURCES): | Impact | With Mitigation Incorporated | Impact | Impact |
| southern portion of the City's Sphere of Influence, have the potent cause intense ground shaking. Because the proposed Project complians associated with strong seismic ground shaking will have no impact of the complete that th | es with Califo | noderate to lar ornia Building | Code regulati | |
| iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | | | \boxtimes | |
| 6iii. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Soils Geotechnical Report) | with High S | hrink-Swell P | otential, and | Appendix E – |
| The project site is located in an area with an area for a low potential Liquefaction Zones Map – Figure PS-2. Compliance with the Califor related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction vindirectly and cumulatively. | rnia Building | Code regulation | ons will ensure | that impacts |
| iv. Landslides? | | | | \boxtimes |
| 6iv. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figur - Geotechnical Report, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Ti The Project site and its surroundings have generally flat topograph Figure 5.6-1 of the General Plan 2025 Program Final PEIR. The directly, indirectly and cumulatively. | tle 17 – Gradi y and is not le | ing Code) ocated in an a | rea prone to la | andslides per |
| b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | | | | \square |
| The Project does not involve substantial development, grading active the loss of topsoil. As such, the Project will have no impact resulting indirectly or cumulatively. c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | ng in substant | | | |
| 6c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Reg General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Soils with Underlain by Steep Slope, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B The Project is not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstab | High Shrink 3 – Soil Types, | -Swell Potent and Appendi | ial, Figure 5 x E – Geotech | .6-1 - Areas nical Report) |
| Project does not involve substantial development, grading activities, | | | | · · |
| significant impacts resulting in a geologic unit or soil becoming un spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse either directly, indirectly | stable resultin | g in an in on- | | |
| d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? | | | | |
| 6d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5 Types, Figure 5.6-5 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potents Building Code as adopted by the City of Riverside and set o Expansive soil is defined under California Building Code. The soi Figure 5.64 – Soils of the General Plan 2025 Program Final PEI potential. Compliance with the recommendations of the soils repo Code- Title 18 and the California Building Code with regard to soil to a less than significant impact level for this Project directly, indir | ial, Appendix ut in Title 16 I type of the s R.) which is rt and applica hazards relat | E – Geotechn of the Riversia subject site is known to hav ble provisions ed to the expa | ical Report, and the Municipal of defined as But e a moderate of the City's | nd California Code) ren soil (See shrink-swell Subdivision |
| e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | | | | |

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| 6e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6 | | | . – | |
| The proposed Project will be served by sewer infrastructure. Therefore | ore, the Projec | t will have no | impact. | |
| | | | | |
| 7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the Project: | | | | |
| Would the Project: a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | | | | |
| 7a. Response: | | | | |
| The proposed Project involves the construction of a wireless telecommunications facility. The Project is consistent with the City's General Plan 2025 policies and statewide Building Code requirements designed to reduce GhG emissions. Since the Project will not result in a net increase in GhG emissions, it will not interfere with the State's goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020 as stated in AB 32 and an 80 percent reduction in GhG emissions below 1990 levels by 2050 as stated in Executive Order S-3-05. Projects that are consistent with the Projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the SCAG are considered consistent with the AQMP growth Projections, since these forecast numbers were used by SCAG's modeling section to forecast travel demand and air quality for planning activities such as the RTP, the SCAQMD's AQMP, RTIP, and the Regional Housing Plan. This Project is consistent with the Projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the SCAG that are consistent with the General Plan 2025 "Typical Growth Scenario." Therefore, this Project will have less than significant impacts with respect to GhG emissions. | | | | |
| b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | | | | |
| 7b. Response: The SCAQMD supports State, Federal and international policies of Global Warming Policy and rules and has established an interim Question A, above, the Project would comply with the City's C provisions designed to reduce GHG emissions. In addition, the Project and regulations during construction and will not interfere with the S by the year 2020 as stated in the AB 32 and an 80 percent reduction in Executive Order S-3-05. Based on the discussion above, the Project regulation related to the reduction in the emissions of GHG and the indirectly and cumulatively in this regard. | Greenhouse General Plan ject would co tate's goals or in GHG emiss ect will not co | Gas (GHG) the control of the control | hreshold. As and State Br SCAQMD app G emissions to 190 levels by 2 by applicable p | indicated in uilding Code plicable rules o 1990 levels 050 as stated lan, policy or |
| 8. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the Project: | | | | |
| a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | | | | |
| 8a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety Ele Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Califor 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional Some hazardous materials will be used during construction and main of equipment will not be maintained or fueled on site. Any spills relaced through best management practices as to not create a significant impact related material either directly, indirectly and cumulatively. | rnia Building at LHMP, 200 intenance. Ho ated to the regularicant haza | Code, Rivers 4 Part 1, OEM wever, the congular use of congular use of congular to the public | ide Fire Departs of Strategic Instruction and Instruction mat lic or the environment | nrtment EOP, Plan) maintenance erials will be ironment. As |
| b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into | | | | |

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| the environment? | | _ | | |
| 8b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety Eld Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Feder Riverside's EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area Strategic Plan) Some hazardous materials will be used during construction and requipment will not be maintained or fueled on site. Any spills related to the contraction of the code of Federal Plan 2025 Public Safety Eld Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Plan 2025 Public Safety Eld Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Plan 2025 Public Safety Eld Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Plan 2025 Public Safety Eld Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Plan 2025 Public Safety Eld Riverside's Eld Riverside's Eld Riverside Operational Area Strategic Plan 2025 Plan 2 | eral Regulation - Multi-Juris maintenance. | ons, Californi sdictional LH However, con | ta Building (MP, 2004 Pastruction and | Code, City of urt 1, OEM's maintenance |
| contained through best management practices as to not create a sign reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the r such, the Project will have less than significant impact related to the either directly, indirectly and cumulatively. | ificant hazard elease of haza | to the public or ordous material | or the environ Is into the env | ment through ironment. As |
| c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | | | \boxtimes | |
| CalARP RMP Facilities in the Project Area, Figure 5.13- Figure 5.13-3 AUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-E AUSD Boundaries, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of Code) The project site is not within one-quarter mile of a school. The profacility. However, the project will still comply with all applicable re 403, which prohibits fugitive dust from construction activities that beyond the property line where construction is occurring. The Prop both the SCAQMD's regional significance thresholds and the Loca for each phase of construction (SRA 2011). Operational emissions activities. No additional personnel would be required on a daily basi number of personnel may be required during brief periods wher Operational emissions would be less than construction emissions. Thimplementation of the applicable air quality management plan. Impof an existing or proposed school would be less than significant. During construction hazardous materials may be used during construction maintenance vehicles will not be maintained or fueled on site. prevented through best management practices. Therefore impacts materials, substances, or waste greater than one-quarter mile of significant directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | schools, Fig the Code of I ject involves gulations. The results in emi- losed Project's lized Significa- would result f s to maintain a certain main he Proposed Po- pacts from haz | the construction of the proposed Project would near the project woul | - Other Sciations, Californations, Californations, Californation of a telecomplex will complex visible in the emissions words (LSTs) for inspection and a Proposed Preations must be not conflict without conflict without within one of the environment of the environment of the californation of the environment of the en | mmunications ply with Rule the atmosphere wild be below all pollutants maintenance oject. A small be performed, the or obstruct e-quarter mile of the construction tent would be bely hazardous |
| d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | | | | |
| 8d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-5 – He CERCLIS Facility Information, Figure 5.7-B – Regulate EnviroStor Database Listed Sites) | ed Facilities i | in TRI Inform | nation and 5. | 7-C – DTSC |
| A review of hazardous materials site lists compiled pursuant to Go site is not included on any such lists. Therefore, the Project would h public or environment directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | |
| e. For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in | | | | |

| | | | - m | |
|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|
| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| , | | Mitigation Incorporated | | |
| 8e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – A | irport Safety | | fluence Area: | s. RCALUCP |
| and March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comp Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (A | prehensive L | and Use Plan | | |
| The Project site is not located within the Riverside County Airp | - | | y Plan (RCA | LUP) which |
| requires an aeronautical study for objects greater than 100 feet in | | | | |
| submitted has an ultimate height of 60 feet. The proposed wireless Title 19 of the Zoning Code Therefore, the Project will have no im | | | | |
| working in the Project area directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | pact resuming | ili a safety lia | zaru ioi peopi | e residing of |
| f. For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would | П | | | |
| the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or | | | | |
| working in the Project area? | | | | |
| 8f. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airg | | | | |
| Because the proposed Project is not located within proximity of a p | | | | |
| the Project will not expose people residing or working in the City to would have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | excessive no | ise levels rela | ed to a private | airstrip and |
| g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an | | | | |
| adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation | | | | |
| plan? | | | | |
| 8g. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Chapter 7.5.7 – Haza | | | | |
| EOP, GP Figure PS 8.1 – Evacuation Routes, 2002 and Riv | verside Opera | tional Area – . | Multi-Jurisdic | ctional |
| LHMP, 2004 Part 1, and OEM's Strategic Plan) The Project will not result in physical alterations to the subject site. | as such the r | roject will not | t impair imple | mentation or |
| physically interfere with an adopted emergency plan. Therefore, n | | | | |
| an emergency response or evacuation plan will occur. | • / | 3, | | |
| h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, | | | | |
| injury or death involving wildland fires, including where | | | | |
| wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | | | | |
| 8h. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-7 – Fire | Hazard Area | as GIS Man I | aver VHFS7 | 2010 City of |
| Riverside's EOP, 2002http://intranet/Portal/uploads/R | | | | |
| Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1/Part 2 and | | | | · · |
| The proposed Project is located in an urbanized area where no wildle | | | | |
| High Fire Severity Zone (VHFSZ) or adjacent to wildland areas or a | | refore no impa | ct regarding v | vildland fires |
| either directly, indirectly or cumulatively from this Project will occu | r. | | | |
| | | | | |
| 9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the Project: | | | | |
| XV. 1 | | | | |
| requirements? | | | | |
| 9a. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.8-A – Benefi | | | | 5 |
| The proposed Project is located within the Santa Ana River Watersh result in minimal physical alterations to the Project site (i.e. grading | | | | |
| involve any use that would have any effect on water quality or be | | | | |
| requirements because the Project involves construction of a wirele | | | | |
| will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to any water | quality stand | ards or waste o | lischarge. | T |
| b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere | | | | |
| substantially with groundwater recharge such that there | | | | |
| would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of | | | | |

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | | | | |
| 9b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 - R Table PF-2 - RPU Projected Water Demand, Table F Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), RPU Map of Water WMWD Urban Water Management Plan) The proposed Project is located within the Riverside South basin. | F-3 – Weste Supply Basins | rn Municipa s, RPU Urban | l Water Distr Water Mana | rict Projected gement Plan |
| wireless telecommunications facility with minimal landscaping. T supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge given (feet) with antenna structure and related ground mounted equip Therefore, there will be a less than significant impact to groundw cumulatively. | he Project wi he minimal ar nent, the proj | ll not substantea of the site to ject will have | tially deplete to be improved e little deman | groundwater d (300 square d for water. |
| c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | | | | |
| 9c. Response: The Project will result in minimal physical alterations to the Project will result in minimal physical alterations to the Project will result in minimal physical alterations to the Project with a construction of a wireless telecommunications facility involving feet) with an antenna structure, minimal erosion or siltation on- or less than significant impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to expect the project will be project with a significant impact directly. | rainage pattern g improvemen off-site will c | ns of the site b t of small por occur. Therefore | ecause the Protion of the site | ject involves (300 square |
| d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | | | | |
| 9d. Response: The Project will not directly or indirectly result in any activity or part through grading, ground disturbance, structures or additional paving site, alter the course of stream or river, or increase the rate or amount of site because the Project consists of a wireless small portion of the site (300 square feet) with an antenna structure. Project will occur and there will be no impact directly, indirectly or or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flood. e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage. | g) that would unt of surface elecommunica Therefore no cumulatively | alter the exist e runoff in a nations facility of looding on that would su | ing drainage pnanner that we involving important or off-site as a | pattern of the buld result in provement of a result of the |
| systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | | | | |
| 9e. Response: (Source: Preliminary Grading Plan) The Project will not directly or indirectly result in any activity or through grading, ground disturbance, structures or additional pavin would exceed capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage polluted runoff because the Project consists of a wireless telecom portion of the site (300 square feet) for an antenna structure. The water exceeding capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage polluted runoff and there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cut | g) that would e systems or p amunications to refore, the Pro- ge systems or | create or con provide substa- facility involvoject will not | tribute runoff intial additionating improvem create or cont | water which al sources of ent of small ribute runoff |
| f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | | | | \boxtimes |

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| The Project will not directly or indirectly result in any activity or physical alteration of the site or surrounding area, (i.e. through grading, ground disturbance, structures or additional paving) that would create or contribute runoff water which would substantially degrade water quality because the Project consists of the construction of a wireless telecommunications facility involving improvement of small portion of the site (300 square feet) with an antenna structure. Therefore, the Project will not degrade water quality and there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | | |
| g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | | | | | |
| 9g. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flo | | eas, and FEM | A Flood Haza | ard Maps | |
| Zone X, Map Number 06065C0065G, effective August 28, 2008) A review of National Flood Insurance Rate Map (Map Number 06065C0065G Effective Date August 28, 2008) and Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas of the General Plan Program FPEIR, shows that the Project is not located within or near a flood hazard area, and does not involve the construction of housing. Further, the subject site is within Zone X, which indicates the site is outside the 0.2% annual flood chance. There will be less than a significant impact caused by this Project directly, indirectly or cumulatively as it will not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. | | | | | |
| h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | | | | | |
| 9h. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps Zone X, Map Number 06065C0065G, effective August 28, 2008) The Project site is not located within or near a flood hazard area as depicted on General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas and the National Flood Insurance Rate Map (Map Number 06065C0065G Effective Date August 28, 2008). Further, the subject site is within Zone X, which indicates the site is outside the 0.2% annual flood chance. Therefore, the Project will not place a structure within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows and less than significant impact will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | | |
| i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | | | | | |
| 9i. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps Zone X, Map Number 06065C0065G, effective August 28, 2008) The Project site is not located within or near a flood hazard area as depicted on General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas and the National Flood Insurance Rate Map (Map Number 06065C0065G Effective Date August 28, 2008) or subject to dam inundation as depicted on General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas. Further, the subject site is within Zone X, which indicates the site is outside the 0.2% annual flood chance. Therefore, the Project will not place a structure within a flood hazard or dam inundation area that would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam and therefore less than significant impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively will occur. | | | | | |
| j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | | | | | |
| 9j. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Chapter 7.5.8 – Hydrology and Water Quality) Tsunamis are large waves that occur in coastal areas; therefore, since the City is not located in a coastal area, no impacts due to tsunamis will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | | |
| 10. LAND USE AND PLANNING: | | | | | |
| Would the Project: | | | | | |
| a. Physically divide an established community? | | | | | |
| 10a.Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urb Riverside GIS/CADME map layers) The Project consists of the construction of a wireless telecommulimproved public streets and other infrastructure and does not involve | nications faci | lity on a site | currently ser | ved by fully | |

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| could alter the existing surrounding pattern of development or an es | tablished com | Incorporated munity. Furth | er, the Project | is consistent |
| with the General Plan 2025, the Zoning Code, the Subdivision Therefore, no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to an estal | Code and the | Citywide De | sign and Sign | |
| b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Projec (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | t , | | | |
| 10b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 20 - Zoning/General Plan Consistency Matrix, Title 19 - Zo Code, Title 17 - Grading Code, Title 20 - Cultural Resor Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines) The Project has been designed to be consistent with the Zoning Cod recommended conditions of approval, the Project is consistent with of Statewide, Regional or Areawide Significance. Further, this pro- | ning Code, Titurces Code, Titurces Code, Titurces and the City of the General Poposal is in con- | tle 18 – Subdivitle 16 – Build wide Design G Plan 2025. Th mpliance with | vision Code, T ings and Con- duidelines, as v is proposal is the development | itle 7 – Noise struction and well, with the not a Project ent standards |
| set forth in the Zoning Code for Wireless Telecommunications Fact the Project would not have a detrimental impact on adjacent land would also be considered. In the judgment of the Planning Division should be considered less than significant, given that a process for Municipal Code. Based on the above-referenced information, the communication facility would not result in significant adverse environmental transfer of the project. | uses. Through in, the potential the consideration proposed Cor | h review of the land of the land of variance additional Use | ne CUP, speci- al impacts of es is specified Permit to allo | fic variances any variance in the City's w a wireless |
| c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | | | | |
| 10c.Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2026 – Zoning/General Plan Consistency Matrix, Figure LU-7 Plan if one, Title 19 – Zoning Code, Title 18 – Subdivision Title 20 – Cultural Resources Code, Title 16 – Buildings at Guidelines | – Redevelopme Code, Title 7 | ent Areas, ente – Noise Code, | er appropriate Title 17 – Gro | Specific ading Code, |
| The proposed Project is not located within an MSHCP Cell and it v natural community conservation plan, as it consists of the construct developed site. Therefore, no impacts directly, indirectly and currelated to the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation P approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan. | tion of a wirel nulatively rela | ess telecommu ted to the pro | inication facili posed project | ty on a fully are expected |
| 11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the Project: | | | | |
| a. Result in the loss of availability of a known minera resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | | | | |
| 11a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources) The Project does not involve extraction of mineral resources or substantial grading activity. No mineral resources have been identified on the Project site and there is no historical use of the site or surrounding area for mineral extraction purposes. The Project site is not, nor is it adjacent to, a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated in the General Plan 2025, specific plan or other land use plan. Therefore, the Project will have no impact on mineral resources directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | |
| b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-importan mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? 11b Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – | | | | |

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| The GP 2025 FPEIR determined that there are no specific areas within the City or Sphere Area which have locally-important mineral resource recovery sites and that the implementation of the General Plan 2025 would not significantly preclude the ability to extract state-designated resources. The proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan 2025. Therefore, there is no impact . | | | | | | |
| 12. NOISE. Would the Project result in: | | | | | | |
| a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | | | | | | |
| 12a. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 A Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Re Compatibility Criteria, FPEIR Table 5.11-I – Existing an Interior and Exterior Noise Standards, Appendix G – Noise Per Implementation Tool N-1 of the General Plan 2025 Noise Elem standards and compatibility issues have been addressed. The project of the Municipal Code, is compliant with the Noise/Land Use Noi Noise Element; and therefore, it does not require an acoustical analy exposure of persons to or the generation of noise levels in excess of cumulatively. | Actilroad Noise of Future Noise of Existing Con- ent, this project meets the Cit- se Compatibilisis. Therefore | e, Figure N-1 se Contour Conditions Report that has been revey's noise standity Criteria M, impacts are 1 | 0 – Noise/La. comparison, Te. ct, Title 7 – Noviewed to ensudards as set follatrix (Figure ess than signi | nd Use Noise table 5.11-E - hise Code) here that noise of the ficant on the | | |
| b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | | | | | | |
| 12b. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Rate Levels For Construction Equipment, Appendix G – Noise F. Construction related activities although short term, are the most concould affect occupants of neighboring uses. Title 7 limits construction weekdays, and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays. No construction As construction activities are temporary and limited, the Project will generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noi to long-term vibration impacts during operation of the proposed used driving is foreseeable in conjunction with development of this Proje exposure of persons to or the generation of excessive ground born standards directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | ilroad Noise, Existing Condimon source ction related an noise is pernal cause a less to see levels. This or during conct. Therefore, ne vibration/no | FPEIR Table itions Report of ground boructivities from hitted on Sundahan significants Project will astruction activities are I | ne noise and v 7:00 a.m. to ays or on Fede t exposure of not generate ovities as no bla ess than signi excess of esta | vibration that 7:00 p.m. on eral holidays. persons to or or be exposed asting or pile ficant on the | | |
| c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project? | | | \boxtimes | | | |
| 12c. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 A Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Ra Levels For Construction Equipment, Appendix G – Noise F. Refer to Response 12a above. As previously mentioned the ambient the Project site will be negligible during construction and operation substantial increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity at significant impact is expected. | ilroad Noise, Existing Condent noise levels activities. | FPEIR Table itions Report on the Project Therefore, the | t site and in this Project will the Project and | ration Source ne vicinity of not cause a | | |
| d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project? | | | | | | |
| 12d. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.11-J – Construction I | Equipment No | oise Levels, Ap | ppendix G – N | oise Existing | | |

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| The primary source of temporary or periodic noise associated with the proposed Project is from construction activity and maintenance work. Construction noise typically involves the loudest common urban noise events associated with minimal grading and construction activities anticipated with the construction of the wireless telecommunications facility. Both the General Plan 2025 and Municipal Code Title 7 (Noise Code) limit construction activities to specific times and days of the week and during those specified times, construction activity is subject to the noise standards provided in the Title 7. Considering the short-term nature of construction and through compliance with the provisions of the Noise Code, the temporary and periodic increase in noise levels due to the construction which may result from the Project are considered less than significant directly, indirectly and cumulatively. | | | | | |
| e. For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels? | | | | | |
| 12e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure N-8 – Rive – March ARB Noise Contour, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Air Reserve Base/March inland Port Comprehensive Land Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005)) The Project site is located approximately 4.5 miles northeasterly of the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (RCALUP). a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area directions. | Use Noise Cond Use Plan the closest airp Therefore, the | ompatibility C (1999),Air In oort (Flabob) a Project will h | riteria, RCAL estallation Con and is not located tave no impact | CUCP, March mpatible Use and within the | |
| f. For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels? | | | Very. | | |
| 12f. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 - Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP, March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (1999)and Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005) Per the GP 2025 Program FPEIR, there are no private airstrips within the City that would expose people working or residing in the City to excessive noise levels. Because the proposed Project consists of development anticipated under the General Plan 2025, is not located within proximity of a private airstrip, and does not propose a private airstrip, the Project will not expose people residing or working in the City to excessive noise levels related to a private airstrip and would have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | | |
| 13. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the Project: | | | | | |
| a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | | | | | |
| 13a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Table LU-3 – Land Use Designations, FPEIR Table 5.12-A – SCAG Population and Households Forecast, Table 5.12-B – General Plan Population and Employment Projections–2025, Table 5.12-C – 2025 General Plan and SCAG Comparisons, Table 5.12-D - General Plan Housing Projections 2025, Capital Improvement Program and SCAG's RCP and RTP) The Project is in an urbanized area and does not propose new homes or businesses that would directly induce substantial population growth, and does not involve the addition of new roads or infrastructure that would indirectly induce substantial population growth because the Project consists of the construction of a wireless telecommunications facility. Therefore, this Project will have no impact on population growth either directly or indirectly. | | | | | |
| b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? 13b. Response: (Source: CADME Land Use 2003 Layer) | | | | | |
| 1000 Response, (Source, Chilin Land Ose 2003 Layer) | | | | | |

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | |
|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|--|
| | | Mitigation Incorporated | | | |
| The Project will not displace existing housing, necessitating the conservation Project site is proposed on a previously improved site that has no exproposed Project. Therefore, there will be no impact on existing housing housing the proposed Project. | kisting housin | g that will be a | removed or af | fected by the | |
| c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | | \boxtimes | |
| 13c. Response: (Source: CADME Land Use 2003 Layer) The Project will not displace any people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because the Project site is proposed on a previously improved site that has no existing housing or residents that will be removed or affected by the proposed Project. Therefore, this Project will have no impact on people, necessitating the need for replacement housing either directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | | |
| 14. PUBLIC SERVICES. | | | | | |
| Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: | | | | | |
| a. Fire protection? | | | | | |
| Statistics and Ordinance 5948 § 1) The Project consists of the construction of a wireless telecommunic located at 1077 Orange Avenue to serve this Project. In addition, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Fire D demand for additional fire facilities or services either directly, indire | with implem epartment pra | nentation of G actices, there | eneral Plan 20 | 025 policies, | |
| b. Police protection? | | | | \square | |
| 14b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-8 – Neighborhood Policing Centers) The Project consists of the construction of a wireless telecommunications facility. Adequate police facilities and services are provided by North Neighborhood Policing Center to serve this Project. There will be no impacts on the demand for additional police facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | | |
| c. Schools? | | | | | |
| 14c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.13-2 – RUSD Bound Generation for RUSD and AUSD By Education Level) | daries, Table | 5.13 - D – RUS | D,, Table 5.13 | 3-G – Student | |
| The Project is non-residential that will not involve the addition of ar age children. Therefore, there will be no impact on the demand for indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | | |
| d. Parks? | | | | \boxtimes | |
| 14d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PR-1 – Parks, Open Spaces and Trails, Table PR-4 – Park and Recreation Facilities, Parks Master Plan 2003, GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.14-A – Park and Recreation Facility Types, and Table 5.14-C – Park and Recreation Facilities Funded in the Riverside Renaissance Initiative) The Project is a non-residential use that will not involve the addition of any housing units that would increase the population. Therefore, there will be no impact on the demand for additional park facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | | |
| e. Other public facilities? | | | | \boxtimes | |
| 14e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure LU-8 – Community Facilities, FPEIR Figure 5.13-5 - Library Facilities, Figure 5.13-6 - Community Centers, Table 5.3-F – Riverside Community Centers, Table 5.13-H – | | | | | |

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Riverside Public Library Service Standards) The Project consists of the construction of a wireless telecommunications facility. Adequate public facilities and services, including libraries and community centers, are provided to serve this Project. In addition, with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Park and Recreation and Community Services and Library practices, there will be no impacts on the demand for additional public facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | | |
| 15. RECREATION. | | | | | |
| a. Would the Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | | | | | |
| 15a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PR-1 – P Recreation Facilities, Figure CCM-6 – Master plan of Tr Table 5.14-A – Park and Recreation Facility Types, and T in the Riverside Renaissance Initiative, Table 5.14-D – Municipal Code Chapter 16.60 - Local Park Development I The Project will not result in an intensification of land use that wo and therefore, there will be no impact on the demand for addition cumulatively. | rails and Bike Cable 5.14-C - Inventory of Fees, Bicycle a uld generate a | eways, Parks . - Park and Re Existing Com Master Plan M any additional | Master Plan 2 creation Faci nmunity Cente May 2007) demand for p | 2003, FPEIR lities Funded ers, Riverside ark facilities | |
| b. Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | | | | | |
| 15b. Response: The Project will not include new recreational facilities or require the therefore, there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively | | or expansion o | f recreational | facilities; | |
| 16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the Project result in: | | | | | |
| Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | | | | | |
| 16a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, FPEIR Figure 5.15-4 – Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio and Level of Service (LOS) (Typical 2025), Table 5.15-D – Existing and Future Trip Generation Estimates, Table 5.15-H – Existing and Typical Density Scenario Intersection Levels of Service, Table 5.15-I – Conceptual General Plan Intersection Improvement Recommendations, Table 5.15-J – Current Status of Roadways Projected to Operate at LOS E or F in 2025, Table 5.15K – Freeway Analysis Proposed General Plan, Appendix H – Circulation Element Traffic Study and Traffic Study Appendix, SCAG's RTP) The Project site is located on a developed and improved site where no increase in intensity of use resulting in any measureable increase in traffic would occur and therefore no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to the capacity of | | | | | |
| b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management | | | | | |

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING | Potentially Significant | | Less Than Significant | No Impact |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| INFORMATION SOURCES): | Impact | With Mitigation Incorporated | Impact | |
| standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | | | | |
| 16b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio and Level of Service Future Trip Generation Estimates, Table 5.15-H – Exist of Service, Table 5.15-I – Conceptual General Plan Inter – Current Status of Roadways Projected to Operate at L Proposed General Plan, Appendix H – Circulation E SCAG's RTP) The Project site does not include a state highway or principal arterior Program (CMP) and the Project is consistent with the Transportatio | (LOS) (Typic ting and Typic section Impro OS E or F in Element Traff | cal 2025), Tal cal Density Scovement Recor 2025, Table 5 fic Study and erside County | ble 5.15-D — cenario Inters mmendations, 5.15K — Free Traffic Stud 's Congestion | Existing and ection Levels Table 5.15-J way Analysis dy Appendix, |
| Program; therefore, there is no impact either directly, indirectly or concern. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | | | | |
| 16c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – A March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Compreh Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (A The Project will not change air traffic patterns, increase air traffic such, this Project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulate | ensive Land Lugust 2005) levels or chan | Use Plan (2 | 1999)and Air | Installation |
| d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | | | | |
| 16d. Response: (Source: Project Site Plans) The Project is located on a site that is currently developed, with modifications will occur that would result in hazards due to design etc. In addition, the proposed use is compatible with other uses on increasing hazards through design or incompatible uses either directly | features such a the site. As s | as driveways, i uch, the Proje | intersection in ct will have n | provements, |
| e. Result in inadequate emergency access? | | | | \boxtimes |
| 16e. Response: (Source: California Department of Transpor Evacuation Routes, Municipal Code, and Fire Code) The Project is located on a site that is currently developed, with modifications are proposed that would affect emergency access; the cumulatively to emergency access. | n all site imp | rovements in | place, and w | here no site |
| f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities)? | | | | |
| 16f. Response: (Source: FPEIR, General Plan 2025 Land Mobility and Education Elements, Bicycle Master Plan, Sc. The Project is located on a site that is currently vacant and where conflicts with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting altern As such, the Project will have no impact directly, indirectly or supporting alternative transportation. | hool Safety Property of the no site modinative transport | rogram – Wall fications will rtation (e.g. bu | k Safe! – Drive occur that wo us turnouts, bi | e Safe!) ould result in cycle racks). |

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING | Potentially Significant | Less Than Significant | Less Than Significant | No Impact |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| INFORMATION SOURCES): | Impact | With Mitigation | Impact | Impact |
| , | | Incorporated | | |
| 17. UTILITIES AND SYSTEM SERVICES. Would the Project: | | | | |
| a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | | | | |
| 17a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PF-2 – Service Areas, , Figure 5.8-1 – Watersheds, Wastewater Int | egrated Mast | er Plan and C | ertified EIR) | |
| The Project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Project is located on a site that is currently developed, with modifications are proposed that would affect wastewater treatment; | h all site imp | provements in | place, and w | here no site |
| cumulatively to wastewater treatment. | | | | |
| b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | | | | |
| 17b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 – RP | II PROJECTE | DOMESTIC W | VATED Sunnly | $(AC_{-}FT/VR)$ |
| Table PF-2 – RPU Projected Water Demand, RPU, FF Demand for RPU Including Water Reliability for 2025, I | EIR Table 5 Figure 5.16-4 | .16-G – Gend – Water Fac | eral Plan Pro | jected Water |
| Sewer Infrastructure and Wastewater Integrated Master Pl The Project will not result in the construction of new or expanded | water or waste | ewater treatme | | |
| consistent with the Typical Growth Scenario of the General Plan 20 determined to be adequate. Therefore, the Project will have no i wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities | mpact resulti | ng in the con | struction of n | |
| c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | | | | |
| 17c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-2 - Drainage Fac | | | | |
| The Project is located on a previously developed/improved site with surfaces will occur that would require or result in the construction existing facilities. Therefore, the Project will have no impact result facilities or the expansion of existing facilities directly, indirectly or | of new storm of new storm | water drainagonstruction of | e facilities or | expansion of |
| d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | | | | |
| 17d. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-3 – Water Service | e Areas, Figu | ire 5.16-4 – W | ater Facilities | s, Table 5.16- |
| E – RPU Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR, T – General Plan Projected Water Demand for RPU includin | | | | Table 5.16-G |
| The Project will not exceed expected water supplies. The Project is | consistent wit | th the General | Plan 2025 Tyj | |
| Scenario where future water supplies were determined to be adequ | | | | |
| and 5.16-J of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Therefore, the Pawater supplies either directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | roject will hav | e no impaci | resulting in the | e insufficient |
| e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project's Projected demand | | | | |
| in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | | | | |
| 17e. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-5 - Sewer Service) | | | | ucture, Table |
| 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the | | | | |
| The Project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of (I consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical Growth Scenario wh | | | | |
| adequate (see Table 5.16-K of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). | | | | |

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|
| anticipates and muscides for this torus of Duniot Thomfore and | | Incorporated | 4: | :4:41 |
| anticipates and provides for this type of Project. Therefore, no is cumulatively will occur. | mpact to was | stewater treatn | nent directly, | indirectly or |
| f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs? | | | | |
| 17f. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.16-A – Existing Land) | fills and Table | e 5.16-M – Est | timated Futur | e Solid Waste |
| Generation from the Planning Area) The Project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical Buil | d out Project | loval where f | utura landfill | aanaaity was |
| determined to be adequate (see Tables 5.16-A and 5.16-M of the Ge | | | | |
| landfill capacity will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | merur r ium 20 | 23 I mai I Eir |). Therefore, | no impact to |
| g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | | | | \boxtimes |
| 17g. Response: (Source: California Integrated Waste Manager | nent Board 20 | 002 Landfill F | l Facility Compl | iance Study) |
| The California Integrated Waste Management Act under the Public I | | - | | |
| least 50% of all solid waste generated by January 1, 2000. The | | | | |
| above State requirements. In addition, the California Green Building | | | | |
| hazardous construction and demolition debris for all Projects and 1 | | | | |
| non-residential Projects beginning January 1, 2011. The proposed requirements as well as the California Green Building Code and as s | | | | |
| regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, no impacts related t | | | | |
| cumulatively. | | | • | , |
| | | | | |
| 18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. | | | | |
| a. Does the Project have the potential to degrade the quality of | | | \boxtimes | П |
| the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or | | | | |
| wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop | | | | |
| below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or | | | | |
| animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or an endangered plant or animal or eliminate | | | | |
| important examples of the major periods of California | | | | |
| history or prehistory? | | | | |
| 18a. Response: (Source: MSHCP, Figure 5.4-8 - MSHCP E | Burrowing Ow | l Survey Area | , Burrowing | Owl Focused |
| Survey Report, prepared by ACT Associates, Inc., dated Se | | | | |
| and Neighborhood Conservation Areas, Figure 5.5-1 - A | | | | |
| Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Appendix D, Title 20 of | | | Code, and A | rchaeologica |
| Survey Report, prepared by ATC Associates, Inc., dated No Potential impacts related to habitat of fish or wildlife species were | | | Resources S | ection of this |
| Initial Study, and were all found to be less than significant . Addition | | | | |
| paleontological resources related to major periods of California a | • • | | | _ |
| discussed in the Cultural Resources Section of this Initial Study, and | were found to | be less than | significant. | |
| b. Does the Project have impacts that are individually limited, | | | \square | |
| but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively | | | | _ |
| considerable" means that the incremental effects of a | | | | |
| Project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past Projects, the effects of other current | | | | |
| Projects, and the effects of probable future Projects)? | | | | |
| 18b. Response: (Source: FPEIR Section 6 – Long-Term Eff | fects/ Cumula | tive Impacts | for the Gener | al Plan 2025 |
| Program) | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | = |
| Because the Project is consistent with the General Plan 2025, no | | | | |
| cumulative impacts of the proposed Project beyond those previou | isly considere | d in the GP 2 | 2025 FPEIR a | are less than |
| I AK'DIHIQIA | | | | |

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| c. Does the Project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | | | \boxtimes | |
| 18c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Section 5 – Environmental Im | pact Analysis | for the Gener | ral Plan 2025 | Program) |
| 0747 | | | | |
| Effects on human beings were evaluated as part of the aesthetics, air and housing, hazards and hazardous materials, and traffic sections of for each of the above sections. Based on the analysis and conclusubstantial adverse effects, directly or indirectly to human beings human beings that result from the proposed Project are less than sign | f this initial states in this . Therefore, | tudy and found initial study, | to be less that the Project w | an significant rill not cause |

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21087, Public Resources Code. Reference: Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151, Public Resources Code; Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino, 202 Cal.App.3d 296 (1988); Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors, 222 Cal.App.3d 1337 (1990).